

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

WILLIAM J. BRYANT, II,

Case No. 5:06-CV-131

Plaintiff,

Hon. Richard Alan Enslen

v.

STATE OF MICHIGAN, *et al.*,

Defendants.

**JUDGMENT**

\_\_\_\_\_/

Plaintiff has initiated the present action against the State of Michigan and the United States of America. The Court has granted Plaintiff's motion to proceed as a pauper in this matter. Having granted Plaintiff's motion to proceed as a pauper, the Court has conducted an initial review of the Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) to determine whether it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Upon review, the Court concludes that Plaintiff's Complaint must be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), a claim may be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted where, even accepting as true Plaintiff's allegations and construing the Complaint liberally in his favor, it appears "beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief." *Herron v. Harrison*, 203 F.3d 410, 414 (6th Cir. 2000) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)).

In his Complaint, Plaintiff asserts that he has been denied access "to the federal and state supreme court due to an illegal investigation without parameter [sic] and with insufficient evidence to have ever ubstructed [sic] my civil and human rights or the courts." Plaintiff has provided absolutely

no details regarding this unintelligible allegation. For relief, Plaintiff requests “federal aid under the dissabilities [sic] act and attrosaties [sic] act.” In sum, Plaintiff has asserted no facts which, if proven, would entitle him to relief under any theory. Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Complaint (Dkt. No. 1) is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Change Venue (Dkt. No. 3) is **DENIED** as moot.

DATED in Kalamazoo, MI:  
October 2, 2006

/s/ Richard Alan Enslen  
RICHARD ALAN ENSLEN  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE